

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

KIRSHA BROWN,

Plaintiff,

vs.

ROBER DILLMAN, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:10-cv-00921-RLH-PAL

REPORT OF FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATION

(IFP & Complaint - Dkt. #1)

Plaintiff Kirsha Brown is proceeding in this action *pro se*. Plaintiff submitted an Application to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis* and a Complaint (Dkt. #1) on June 15, 2010. The court approved Plaintiff's Application to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis* and screened the pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e). See Screening Order, Dkt. #5. The undersigned found that Plaintiff's Complaint failed to state a claim and allowed Plaintiff thirty days to file an amended complaint. Plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint, requested an extension of time, or taken any other action to prosecute this case. Plaintiff was warned that failure to comply with the screening order would result in a recommendation to the District Judge that this case be dismissed. Accordingly,

IT IS THE RECOMMENDED that Plaintiff's Complaint (Dkt. #6) be **DISMISSED**.

Dated this 13th day of August, 2010.


 PEGGY A. JELEN
 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

NOTICE

These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen days after being

1 served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written objections with the court.
2 Pursuant to Local Rule of Practice (LR) IB 3-2(a), any party wishing to object to the findings and
3 recommendations of a magistrate judge shall file and serve *specific written objections* together with
4 points and authorities in support of those objections, within fourteen days of the date of service of the
5 findings and recommendations. The document should be captioned “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s
6 Findings and Recommendations.” The parties are advised that failure to file objections within the
7 specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court’s Order. *Martinez v. Ylst*, 951 F.2d 1153
8 (9th Cir. 1991). The points and authorities filed in support of the specific written objections are subject
9 to the page limitations found in LR 7-4.